

REMARKS

SUMMARY

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 60-72 and 74-79 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claim 73 has been objected to. Claims 60-79 remain in the application. Claims 60, 62, 75 and 78 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 60-72, and 74-79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,753,842 (hereinafter Williams), in view of McLaughlin et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,975,694 (hereinafter McLaughlin).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. However, in the interest of expeditiously bringing prosecution to a conclusion, Applicant has amended claim 60 and 75. Claim 60, as amended, now requires a mobile communication device comprising, *inter alia*, a processor unit configured to cause the light unit to output light from a selected one of the light sources to indicate a source of a received message and simultaneously to output light from a selected second of the light sources to indicate a second source of a second received message.

Williams teaches a system that may enable a backlight when receiving an incoming telephone call either during predetermined hours and/or based on a photosensor which detects ambient light levels. As noted by the Examiner, Williams fails to disclose outputting light from a selected one of the light sources to indicate a source of a received message. Williams, thus, further fails to show simultaneously outputting light from a selected second of the light sources to indicate a second source of a second received message.

McLaughlin does not remedy the deficiencies of Williams. McLaughlin teaches a paging receiver with a visual alert means 26, which generates a plurality of colors and is activated in response to the reception of a paging address matching an address in code plug 24. See e.g. Col 2, line 67 - Col. 3, line 4. Unlike claim 1 of the instant application, this “address” disclosed by

McLaughlin as activating the visual alerts is not the address of the source of the message. It is the address assigned to the receiving pager and used to identify that pager. In a conventional paging system, pagers are programmed to decode one or more addresses. A match indicates that the page is intended for that pager, triggering an alert to the user. The POC-SAG paging protocol assigns four addresses to each pager, with each address capable of four address functions. Each address function has a specified audible, visual and/or tactile alert pattern to alert the user. McLaughlin states that it is desirable to keep the same alert for each of the four functions function, while distinguishing between the addresses assigned to the pager. See Col 1, lines 17-27. McLaughlin teaches that, in response to decoding of a matching address, the indicator of visual alert means 26 flashes in the selected color. See Col. 2, line 67- Col. 3, line 4. The alert is generated having a pattern corresponding to one of the four functions of the address. See Col. 4, lines 9-41. The lighted alerts do not indicate the source of the received page. Rather, they identify to which of the pager's assigned addresses the page was sent.

McLaughlin fails remedy the deficiencies of Williams. McLaughlin at least fails to disclose a processor unit is configured to cause the light unit to output light ... to indicate a source of a received message. Further, McLaughlin fails to disclose that the processor unit is configured to output light simultaneously from a selected second of the light sources to indicate a second source of a second received message. Therefore, claim 60 is patentable over the proposed combination of Williams in view of McLaughlin.

Claim 75, as amended, contains in substance at least the same limitations as claim 60, namely a means ... to ouput light to indicate a source of a received message and simultaneously to output light from a selected second of the light sources to indicate a second source of a second received message. Thus, Claim 75 is patentable over the proposed combination of Williams in view of McLaughlin.

Claims 61-72, 74, and 76-79 depend from claims 60 and 75 respectively, correspondingly incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 61-72, 74, 76-79 are patentable over the proposed combination of Williams in view of McLaughlin.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In "Allowable Subject Matter," item 2 on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 73 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 73 depends from claim 60. Based on the amendments and reasons discussed above, Claim 73 is patentable over the cited references. Therefore, claim 26, which depends from claim 15, is allowable without having to be rewritten in independent form.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 60-79 is solicited in light of the arguments and amendments herein. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 222-9981. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: January 4, 2007 by: /Al AuYeung/
Al AuYeung
Reg. No.: 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981